

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

ROLAND-CHARLES BROCKRIEDE,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATTHEW MILLER, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-10117

HONORABLE STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III

\_\_\_\_\_/

**ORDER DISMISSING THE COMPLAINT [1]**

Plaintiff Roland-Charles Brockriede filed a nearly 400-page Notice of Removal and seemingly attempted to remove several State court matters to this Court. ECF 1. In 2009, Judge Denise Paige Hood issued an order—in a case that involved similar issues—that enjoined Plaintiff from filing any new action in the Eastern District of Michigan from a particular address without first obtaining leave. *Michigan v. Brockriede*, Case No. 2:09-cv-14626, ECF 14. The Court will dismiss the instant case, which was filed from an address different than the one at which Plaintiff was enjoined. ECF 2.

Some of the State actions that Plaintiff challenged in the current case are the same challenges he attempted to raise in federal court in 2009. *See* ECF 1, PgID 11; *Michigan v. Brockriede*, Case No. 2:09-cv-14626, ECF 5, PgID 151. New issues raised in the present case include a State eviction proceeding, ECF 1, PgID 14–15, a traffic ticket he received in 2022, *id.* at 1–18, and several lawsuits Plaintiff filed in State court against State court judges, *id.* at 19–30. But Plaintiffs may not remove civil

actions; only Defendants may remove actions to federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a). Moreover, as Judge Hood explained in 2009, the Court lacks jurisdiction over the State court proceedings. *Michigan v. Brockriede*, Case No. 2:09-cv-14626, ECF 5, PgID 151. The Court will therefore dismiss the complaint.

Additionally, the Clerk of the Court issued a notice that required Plaintiff to pay the filing fee or file an application to proceed in forma pauperis no later than February 7, 2024. ECF 3. The notice warned that the case “may be dismissed” if Plaintiff failed to pay the filing fee. *Id.* at 400. Yet Plaintiff failed to do so here. The Court will therefore dismiss the complaint and deny Plaintiff leave to appeal in forma pauperis because he cannot take an appeal in good faith. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3); *McGore v. Wigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 605 (6th Cir. 1997).

Last, because Plaintiff made many similar, frivolous arguments in this Court over the last two decades, the Court will enjoin Plaintiff from filing new actions in this district from any address without first obtaining leave. *See Feathers v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.*, 141 F.3d 264, 269 (6th Cir. 1987) (explaining district court’s discretion to impose prefiling restrictions “in matters with a history of repetitive or vexatious litigation”).

**WHEREFORE**, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the complaint [1] is **DISMISSED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff is **ENJOINED** from filing any further correspondence or pleadings from “Roland Charles Brockriede” in the Eastern District of Michigan without first **OBTAINING** permission from this Court and **PROVIDING** proof of permission to the Clerk of the Court.

This is a final order that closes the case.

**SO ORDERED.**

s/ Stephen J. Murphy, III  
STEPHEN J. MURPHY, III  
United States District Judge

Dated: February 12, 2024

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on February 12, 2024, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/ R. Loury  
Case Manager